REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 30-31, 33-38, 42-43, 45-46, 48-50, 54-55, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over "UPnP AV Architecture: 0.83" to Ritchie et al. ("*Ritchie*") in view of "ContentDirectory: 1 Service Template Version 1.01 to Debique et al. ("*Debique*"); rejected claims 32, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique* and further in view of "Playing Audio on Your PPC From Your Desktop" to Conger et al. ("*Conger*"); and rejected claims 40 and 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique* and further in view of "Hypertext Transfer Protocol -- HTTP/1.1" to Fielding et al. ("*Fielding*")..

Claims 30-58 remain pending.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 30-31, 33-38, 42-43, 45-46, 48-50, 54-55, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique*.

Independent claim 30 recites a content providing server that includes among other things "a content distribution control section that executes live streaming of the content to the client via the local area network" and "wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, as a single unit of controlled content, on the basis of a control request corresponding a second channel list received from the client."

On pages 4 and 18 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner appears to concede that *Ritchie* does not disclose the claimed "channels," but relies on *Debique* to allegedly disclose the channels.

According to *Debique*, "a "Media Server" device might contain a significant portion of the homeowner's audio, video, and still-image library. In order for the homeowner to enjoy this content, the homeowner must be able to browse the objects stored on the Media Server, select a specific one, and cause it to be "played" on an appropriate rendering device." *Debique* at page 5, Section 1.1. *Debique* defines an "object" as "[a]ny data entity that can be returned by a Content Directory Service from a browsing or searching action." *Debique* at page 6, Section 2.3.

Debique fails to disclose streaming "content, corresponding to the channels, as a single unit of controlled content," as recited in claim 30. *Debique* uses a unique object id assigned to each object enumerated in the Content Directory to individually play each data object on various rendering devices, and does not stream "content, corresponding to the channels, as a single unit of controlled content," as recited in claim 30.

Ritchie states:

> the Control Point is managing multiple devices, all interactions occur in isolation between the Control Point and each device. The Control Point coordinates the operation of each device to achieve an overall, synchronized, end-user effect. The individual devices do not interact directly with each another. . . (page 3, section 4)

> the Control Point uses UPnP to initialize and configure both devices so that the desired content is transferred from one device to the other . . . (page 4)

> the Control Point is the only component that initiates UPnP actions . . . (page 6, paragraph 6)

> "MediaServers are capable of transferring multiple content items at the same time, e.g. a hard-disk-based audio jukebox may be able to simultaneously stream multiple audio files to the network. In order to support this type of MediaServer, the ConnectionManager assigns a unique

Connection ID to each "connection" (i.e. each stream) that is made. This ConnectionID allows a third-party Control Points to obtain information about active connections of the MediaServer (page 7, section 5.1)

The control point in *Ritchie* configures the devices each time a content is transferred, and prior to transferring multiple contents, each content is assigned a unique connection ID in order for the control points to configure the devices. Therefore, both *Debique* and *Ritchie* assign unique identifications to individual contents and individually transfer or separately stream individual contents identified by individual content IDs.

Debique and *Ritchie*, even if combined do not teach "a content distribution control section that executes live streaming of the content to the client via the local area network" and "wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, as a single unit of controlled content, on the basis of a control request corresponding a second channel list received from the client," as recited in claim 30.

Independent claims 42, 45, 54, and 57-58 , while of different scope than claim 30, distinguish over *Debique* and *Ritchie* for at least the same reasons as claim 30.

Claims 31, 33-38, 43, 46, 48-50, and 55 depend from claims 30, 42, 45, and 54 respectively. Accordingly, *Debique* and *Ritchie* fail to disclose the subject matter of claims 31, 33-38, 43, 46, 48-50, and 55.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 32, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, and 56 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique* and further in view of *Conger*.

Conger fails to cure the deficiencies of *Ritchie* and *Debique*. *Conger* fails to teach or suggest, "a content distribution control section that executes live streaming of the content to the client via the local area network" and "wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, as a single unit of controlled content, on the basis of a control request corresponding a second channel list received from the client" as recited in claim 30. Accordingly, *Ritchie, Debique*, and *Conger*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 30.

Claims 32, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, and 56 depend from one of independent claims 30, 42, 45, and 54. Accordingly, *Ritchie, Debique*, and *Conger* fail to disclose the subject matter of claims 32, 39, 41, 44, 47, 53, and 56.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 40 and 52 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ritchie* in view of *Debique* and further in view of *Fielding*.

Fielding fails to cure the deficiencies of *Ritchie* and *Debique*. *Fielding* fails to teach or suggest, "a content distribution control section that executes live streaming of the content to the client via the local area network" and "wherein the content distribution control section streams the content, corresponding to the channels, as a single unit of controlled content, on the basis of a control request corresponding a second channel list received from the client" as recited in claim 30. Accordingly, *Ritchie, Debique*, and *Fielding*, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose the subject matter of claim 30.

Claims 40 and 52 depend from one of independent claims 30 and 45.

Accordingly, *Ritchie*, *Debique*, and *Fielding* fail to disclose the subject matter of claims 40 and 52.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the pending claims are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: March 12, 2008   By: _____
Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921